



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the part of the corporation cannot be validated by the stockholders' subsequent ratification.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Corporations, Dec. Dig. § 426.* 3 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 547, et seq.]

7. Taxation (§ 210*)—Exemptions—Surrender—Enlarged Powers—Acceptance.—Evidence held to show that enlarged powers, under Act April 2, 1902 (Laws 1901-02, c. 667) were not accepted by a railroad company until after July 10, 1902, the date of taking effect of Const. § 158 (Code 1904, p. cclviii), providing that a corporation's acceptance of new powers shall be deemed a surrender of certain exemption from taxation.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Taxation, Cent. Dig. § 335; Dec. Dig. § 210.* 13 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 111.]

Error to Circuit Court of City of Richmond.

Suit by the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Company against the Commonwealth. Judgment for plaintiff, and defendant brings error. Reversed.

The Attorney General and *Wm. A. Anderson*, for the Commonwealth.

Braxton & Eggleston, for defendant in error.

STEARNES v. GOAD, Clerk.

[69 S. E. 1101.]

Records (§ 5*)—Fees—Recording "Option" Contract.—An option being a mere right to purchase, the consideration of the contract is the consideration given for the right to purchase, and not the value of the subject-matter of the contract; therefore the recording fee for recording an option contract to purchase land will under Act March 17, 1910 (Acts 1910, c. 315), which graduates the fees for recording such contracts according to the consideration, be based upon the consideration given for the contract and not upon the land in question.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see Records, Cent. Dig. § 18; Dec. Dig. § 5.* 2 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 839.]

For other definitions, see Words and Phrases, vol. 6, pp. 5000-5002; vol. 8, p. 7739.]

Petition by O. L. Stearnes for mandamus against Dexter Goad, Clerk of the County of Carroll, to compel the recording of certain contracts. Writ issued.

W. D. Cardwell, for plaintiff.

The Attorney General, for respondent.

*For other cases see same topic and section NUMBER in Dec. Dig. & Am. Dig. Key No. Series & Rep'r Indexes.